



Meeting Summary March 10, 2021

Attendance

Panel Members: Fred Marino, Chair
Bob Gorman, Vice Chair
Dan Lovette
Larry Quarrick

DPZ Staff: Anthony Cataldo, Nick Haines

Applicants and Presenters: John Carney, Justin Mihalik, Robert Jones

1. **Call to Order** – DAP Chair Fred Marino opened the meeting at 7:16 p.m.
2. **Review of Plan No. 21-02:** Euclid Corners Lightbridge Academy, Elkridge MD

Owner/Developer: Bell Grove Corporation
Engineer: Benchmark Engineering
Architect: Jam Arch

Background

The 1.5-acre site is comprised of Parcel A, zoned CE-CLI. The existing property has access from Route 1 onto via Euclid Avenue (a paper street). The CE-CLI (Corridor Employment – Continuing Light Industrial) zoning should provide for new office, flex, and light industrial uses, while reducing the spread of strip commercial development and encouraging consolidation of fragmented parcels. Child day care centers and nursery schools are permitted uses under the CE Zoning.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant presented the plans for the Euclid Corners which proposes the construction of a 6,200 square foot two-story day care facility for 160 children called Lightbridge Academy. Improvements include the proposed structure and infrastructure, parking lot, landscaping, fencing, retaining wall, stormwater management and outdoor play areas.

Exterior materials include glass, brick and stucco veneer, and a mansard roof. The design aesthetic is in keeping with the overall design philosophy of the district and was designed to match the existing look of the buildings in the area.

Staff Presentation

The project has direct frontage along Washington Blvd in the Route 1 corridor and subject to the requirements of the *Route 1 Design Manual*. Staff requested that DAP *evaluate and make recommendations on site layout, orientation, location of the building and parking areas. Staff also requested comments relating to the architecture, building materials, and scale and orientation of the structure, and how it relates to Route 1. Lastly Staff requested comments regarding the circulation*

within the site itself and any potential improvements that could be made moving forward with the design.

DAP Questions and Comments

Site Design

DAP commented that the building and parking placement and layout seemed to be in the most advantageous places on the site given the existing site constraints. DAP asked if the property conformed with the Route 1 design guidelines and asked if proposed sidewalks, street trees and lighting would be incorporated along the Route 1 frontage. DAP suggested that the applicant work with the County and State Highway Administration to incorporate the necessary improvements along the road frontage.

DAP expressed concern with the amount of parking on site and asked how many staff would be on site. The applicant responded that the facility would have between 25 and 29 staff on rotating schedules where staff are coming and leaving throughout the day according to their shifts. The applicant also said that the drop off and pick up of the children would require parking and walking the children into the center for drop off and walking in to pick up their children. The applicant elaborated that studies performed at similar centers call for the amount of parking provided for the project.

DAP was concerned with safety along the southern end of the parking lot as the grading slopes down into the stormwater management infrastructure. DAP suggested adding a small fence along the southern parking lot boundary to keep people and children out of the stormwater management area.

Landscape

DAP recommended the applicants add some shade trees along the southern portion of the site to provide shade for the outdoor elements during the hot summer months. The applicant responded that they were avoiding trees near the play areas to promote a safer and cleaner site but were instead proposing 20 by 20 shade canopies over the play equipment areas to provide shade.

DAP suggested adding landscaping along the southern edge of the parking lot in between the proposed fencing and stormwater management infrastructure. DAP commented that the site appeared bare and suggested incorporating additional plantings along the front of the building and around the parking areas where applicable. DAP also suggested revising the plant material palette to alternative species that could provide better screening and shade based on site placement. DAP also recommended incorporating native species with the plantings provided on site.

DAP asked if the stormwater management basin was going to be planted. The applicant responded that the basin would be planted with grasses and an assortment of shrubs.

Architecture

DAP commented that they liked the proposed mansard roof and asked if the brown base material shown on the elevations was going to be. The applicant responded that the base will be brick all the way across the façade as well as the columns but will have different tones. DAP commented on the applicants attempt to bring down the scale of the building but thought that the building still seemed too heavy and suggested shifting some of the base colors further up the vertical aspect of the structure.

DAP commented on the scale of the building and noted the northern elevation seems imposing with the architecture and massing adding to the issues with scale. DAP suggested using a similar approach with the elements provided on the southern elevation such as the dimensions of the portico and the window

placement relative to the building finishes. DAP suggested the applicant consider scaling down the upper portions of the façade to help the building feel more in tune with the surrounding neighborhood.

DAP Motions for Recommendations

DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman made the following motion:

For the applicant to take another look at the landscape plan to soften up the edges of the parking lot with emphasis on shade tree placement.

DAP Chair Fred Marino seconded.

Vote: 4-0

DAP Member Dan Lovette made the following motion:

That the applicant look at reducing the verticality and scale of the building, particularly from the Route 1 side.

DAP Member Fred Marino seconded the motion.

Vote 4-0

DAP Member Larry Quarrick made the following motion:

That the applicant strives to use at least 50% native plant materials in terms of trees, shrubs, and perennials in the proposed landscape plan.

DAP Vice Chair Bob Gorman seconded the motion.

Vote 4-0

DAP Chair Fred Marino made the following motion:

For the applicant to review the Route 1 Design Guidelines and work with DPZ and Maryland State Highways to do improvements can be done along the Route 1 frontage.

DAP Member Dan Lovette seconded.

Vote: 4-0

3. Other Business

DPZ noted no other business on the agenda.

4. Call to Adjourn

DAP Chair Fred Marino adjourned the meeting at 8:19 p.m.